

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-41, 43-100, and 102-109 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 6, 11-13, 16, 25, 26, 30, 34-37, 43-46, 50-58, 67-70, 73, 78-83, 92-96, 102-105, and 109 are amended by the present amendment.

In the Office Action of August 8, 2005, Claims 1, 11, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and Claims 1-41, 43-100, and 102-109 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fairchild et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,320, herein “Fairchild”), in view of Fan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,310,692, herein “Fan”). The Advisory Action dated October 21, 2005, has maintained these rejections.

Initially, Applicants have found that the present application includes various paragraphs that have been inadvertently translated from the Japanese priority document JP2000-260143. Therefore, the specification is amended to correct those mistranslations and a certified English translation of the priority document of the present application is filed together with this application. It is noted that the originally filed specification incorporates by reference the entire content of the priority document JP2000-260143, at page 44, lines 3-5. Thus, it is believed that no new matter has been added.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 1, 11, and 25 have been amended to delete the language noted by the outstanding Office Action regarding Claim 1. No new matter has been added. Regarding Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 1 shows the remote control system 1 and the plurality of apparatuses 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, and 24, and Figure 2 shows the remote control

system 1 and the terminal units 7a-7n. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-41, 43-100, and 102-109 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fairchild and Fan, the independent claims have been amended to more clearly recite that status information is collected from other image forming apparatuses including in a same group as at least an image forming apparatus when apparatus information of the at least an image forming apparatus is received by the central control system. Applicants note that the claim amendments find support in the specification as presently amended. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 1 is directed to a remote control system that is configured to control a plurality of apparatuses divided into a predetermined number of groups including at least an image forming apparatus. The remote control system includes, *inter alia*, an information collection unit that is configured to collect status information from other image forming apparatuses included in the same group as the at least an image forming apparatus when apparatus information of the at least an image forming apparatus is received by a central control system of the remote control system.

In other words, the claimed remote control system is triggered to collect the status information from various forming apparatuses other than a specific image forming apparatus but grouped in a same group as the specific image forming apparatus when apparatus information from the specific image forming apparatus is received by the central control system. All the independent claims have been amended to recite the above-discussed features.

Turning to the applied art, Fairchild does not teach or suggest that status information of only image forming apparatuses including in the same group as a specific image forming

apparatus is collected by an information collection unit and the information collection unit does not collect the status information of the specific image forming apparatus. Further, Fairchild does not teach or suggest that the status information of other image forming apparatuses is collected by the central control system only when the apparatus information from the specific image forming apparatus is received at the central control system.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Fan for teaching controlling image forming apparatuses. However, Fan does not overcome the deficiencies of Fairchild discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims and all the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Fairchild and Fan, either alone or in combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.  
Limited Recognition No. L0037

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM/RFF:sjh:ys  
I:\ATTY\RFF\21S\212557\212557US-AF.DOC